

You say that Kerry gave "testimony that was in flat disagreement with Jim Garrison's (and Harold Weisberg's) 'conspiracy' theory". This is a combination of dubious statements. First, you do not know what testimony, if any, Kerry gave on this. The best you can say is you know that he claims to have testified to. Next, what is this alleged "theory"? You do not specify, and the reason is obvious, you cannot. Further, if there is a single theory, ^{Garrison} ~~he~~ and I, from what we have both said in public, are not in agreement on it. Moreover, does your utilization of quotes around "conspiracy" reflect the belief there was none? If so, you are in basic agreement with the Warren Report. If not, this is a cheap device.

You repeat this utter nonsense in the same paragraph, for whatever trickery you have in mind: "...especially when that same DA is the proud author (or coauthor, considering Weisberg's involvement)..." Again, I ask you to specify, and to cite where I expressed such a "theory".

"...there is something of a feud between Mr. Garrison and Mr. Weisberg over who should get the credit for discovering Thornley's 'key' role". Where, except in your sick mind? And if we are ~~feeding~~ ^{feeding}, how are we elsewhere in your drivvel such close collaborators? And where did I ever say your flower boy who practises personal violence had but a single, one "key" role? Do you never have anything but assumptions, and never have any basis for them?

"...the press release might even be the basis for a lawsuit against Garrison, Weisberg and others responsible for ~~its~~ ^{its} content and release" ~~in reference to the press release.~~

Here, as usual, you invent, with the wit and subtlety of a child whistling himself past the graveyard. You have and had no basis for assuming or alleging I had anything to do with the press ^{release} ~~release~~, in any way. You certainly know nothing at all about Garrison if you think anyone ever ^{has} has anything to do with ~~them~~ ^{this}. Further, you know nothing at all about my attitude toward them. This is manufactured falsehood, made up of nothing but your venom, sickness or both.

On what basis do you say Kerry has the problem of proving ~~where~~ ^{the matter} he was ~~not~~ ^{was} at a particular bar? Of course, I know, your oracle told you.

While I have no way of knowing the testimony, I do know what Barbara told me. I presume she said essentially the same thing officially. You do not accurately reflect it. You are, at least, consistent in this. And she is not "Miss" Reid.

With your typical devotion to nothing but honest reporting, you have the defense subpenseing the nonexistent altar, the thing put together with your good and trusted friend's ^{Kerry's} help and for the ^{of a TV show} single purpose only, pretending, for all the world as though you know what you speak of, that it is of continuing existence and has been in continuous and reprehensible use. This is intended ^{libel} and scrupulous dishonesty, effective as propaganda and no less so as a measure of the integrity of Dave Lifton. From here you conjecture, as though you have contact with reality, "it will probably be the first time an altar(sic) has become evidence in a court case since the salem (sic) witch trials. It is preposterous, therefore, that Weisberg should attempt to fob off Miss Reid, in his letter to Open City, as "a writer and TV producer". Preposterous, indeed, to present reality where there is the option of Lifton fiction - ^{libel}.

"...she is an old-time friend of Garrison and key members of his staff who are responsible for the Thornley investigation...", which is the typical Lifton way of saying that years ago, when Garrison and a single member of his staff lived in the French Quarter, as Barbara did, they knew her casually, as they knew hundreds of others, had no contact with her for years, had no contact with her on the investigation for more than a year after they began ^{it, also} ~~this investigation~~ ^{after they} and had been conducting what you describe as their "Thornley" investigation for some time without speaking to her. It is also Lifton's way of not telling those upon whose trust he steadfastly imposes that contrary to this, ^{Kerry} was her close friend, until he left New Orleans, trusted her then, accepted and asked favors of her, and didn't discover that she was a "witch" or otherwise a bad person until it suited his immediate purposes to forget the past and misrepresent the past and present.

Is it accurate to describe Liebler's function and responsibilities as you do, "Since Liebler's area of work on the Commission was New Orleans"?

my
 to those so anxiously awaiting your every word? Certainly not because these letters are anything but what you represent, is it, Dave?

You then say the kids "enlisted my aid in arranging a debate between Wesley Liebeler and Harold Weisberg...I helped Harvey Levin, President of 'Boy's League'...draft letters to ^{of} both men..." How quaint a representation this is of Harvey Levin having telephoned me and my agreeing by phone, without any letter! You say this was "last Christmas". How Lifton-like a ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ representation of the date on the first letter I got from Levin, January 16. You say you "helped draft" the letter? They you know that by the time the first was written everything had been agreed to, even the topic selected, and the date for the debate set. It was March 22, and the correspondence made clear the school insisted on adherence to this date, with no rescheduling had the Clay Shaw trial coincided. Even "the format and ground rules" had been determined before your invaluable help was first, from your own account of it, needed or offered.

"The debate, " you say, "did not come off because of sheer dishonesty, involving debating arrangements and matters of money, on the part of Harold Weisberg in his dealings with the high school group involved. The events left a bad taste in the mouth(sic) of the students arranging the debate, who learned to their chagrin that Harold Weisberg was an individual who simply could not be trusted. The event unfolded as follows:" There follows what is not the case, the typical falsehood being, "In this first conversation, Weisberg made it quite plain that he wanted both round trip airplane ~~fare~~ ^{my} and an honorarium." As you know and knew, this is entirely false. I offered to speak without any fee, saying only that were Liebeler paid, I'd expect what he got, and going farther, asking the students to tell him this. ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ You add, gratuitously, "To Weisberg, who was ^u pushing the sale of 4 books at the time, a free trip to California was, apparently, 'speaking for nothing'." As you well know, my books have never been on general sale, in California or elsewhere, were not generally available at that time, and it was in no way *possible*

for there to have been a meaningful return from the sale of the books. To me, as to anyone without those special twists of Dave Lifton's mind, speaking without getting paid for it is, indeed, "speaking for nothing". Why do you not tell your audience what Mark, for example, gets for his speeches?

You then say what is entirely false, that "the debate arrangements were successfully culminated for 3/22", which had absolutely nothing to do with what you describe as you "help", "and the tickets were about to be sold at a price which would raise enough ^{my} money so that each man could be paid an honorarium, and Weisberg would get his airline fare paid. ^{At} that time, a series of letters arrived from Harold Weisberg which were somewhat troubling (1/68, 2/68). Now, have, can it be that with these letters in your possession, you cannot give the exact dates? They are 1/19/ 68 and 1/26/68. My February letter, dated the 21st, was after your "help", which resulted in the ^{February 19} cancellation of the debate, of which I was notified by telegram and letter ^{of Mr} dated ~~February~~ 9.

Here you go again, " First Harold wanted to sell his books at the door." This is not a quotation, as the sale of books at a lecture is in no way exceptional. I will quote that part of that letter in a moment. "In another letter he seemed to imply that he just might not be able to attend the debate, after all". This is exactly contrary to the assurance I gave, as the direct quotation you could not honestly make and say this will prove. "He also wanted the school to pay for his cab fare from his Maryland farm to the Washington airport. As one high school student working on the project put it, they expected Weisberg's next letter to request ' 5¢ for gum'."

With your help, no doubt.

Then, in the ~~xxxxxxx~~ beginning of February, a letter ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{thought I was paying} sailed in (and all the time I ~~paid~~ the government for air carrying) arrived from Harold saying, "I will be away for about 18 days...Should you write me, I will be in touch with my wife just about daily..." Then you say, "What was Harold doing for the next 18 days. The mystery was not long in being resolved. To the astonishment and outrage of the high school students,

to raise money for Harold Weisberg's forthcoming airline fare so that he could come to California, Harold's visage was appearing on Southern California TV screens and his voice was on various local talk programs. Harold ~~was~~ going away for 18 days to Southern California. ~~This~~ blatant act of deceit and dishonesty was too much for those sponsoring the debate. At issue was whether one could trust anything Weisberg said, any commitment he made. The debate was called off."

Before the direct quotation you avoided simply so you could misrepresent and libel, let me ask you if in all the time I have been making appearances anywhere at all, there is a single commitment I have failed to keep, for any reason whatsoever or even one for which I have been as much as a single minute late? The fact is, that nothing, not even blizzards, has ever stopped me, that I work around the clock to keep my commitments or those made in my absence and without my knowledge by those helping me. You very well know this.

However, if this is the reason the debate was cancelled, you certainly "helped" the kids to lie abundantly and redundantly in their announcement, for their reasons are as specific as they are incredible; "The principal told me...the school had decided that they were not at liberty to finance anyone to come to California to speak or otherwise". I can just imagine who "helped" with these ~~xxxxxxx~~ exact words, for I was not being "financed" to "come to California" or ~~any~~ kind of "otherwise". "It is very unfortunate that this was not brought to my attention earlier..." As it was unlikely, for the principal was in on this from the very beginning, as the quotes to come will show. Now what I was doing was making a special trip out there for the sole purpose of making appearance at ~~the~~ that school, at the time it selected. There is and was never any question about this.

Now first of all, I did not just go to sunny "Southern California". I went first to Chicago, then to San Francisco, and I had to leave Los Angeles before completing the scheduled work. I did much more than just make appearances. As with all my trips, this was also a working one, on the case, in all three cities. I conducted three interviews with Loren Hall alone on that one, and many

others with a number of other people. Somehow, for all his great skill and competence, for all of his diligent work on the case some^{equately} financed by a beneficent father, Dave had never been able to do these things right where he lived. Somehow, those others ^{who} had earlier seen Hal and Howard ~~and~~ ^{had} for some mysterious reason (no ^{of} doubt having to do with the refusal of people to trust me because of my "sheer dishonesty" and other undesirable characteristics so clear in your manufacturing), ~~had~~ not quite been able to turn this pair ~~on~~, ~~among others, one~~. My work in both west-coast cities on that trip was so concentrated that ~~in each~~ ^{each} I actually worked around the clock, in San Francisco, as you can easily confirm, ending ~~that first xxxxxx~~ ^{first} working day, with but two or three hours sleep ^{and the next} ~~the night before the night before~~, 33 hours after arriving, and then got only a nap before having to return to work. Not even one with as fertile an imagination as you could have squeezed in a single other thing on that trip, with all your skillful manufactures. And I had to and did catch the first plane out the morning of February 16, for I had a standing appointment for work with others at home.

In any event, all this is irrelevant, save that you have sought to create something that does not exist. The school had selected the March 22 date, not one in February, and they had declined any change, as will become clear, before I left on this trip.

Now what did my letters really say? In my very first letter, as I ^{offered} had earlier by phone, I ~~agreed~~ ^{offered} "that if any other group sponsors me while I am there I will put them in touch with you for cost sharing, which I think would be right!" Rather than demanding an exorbitant charge for a cab trip, and there is nothing either unusual or wrong in using a cab, particularly with the weather we then had, which had just forced cancellation of all local events, what I ^{not ask them to pay} actually said is that I'd ~~have no food or housing costs, to ask them to pay~~ again, quite normal when expenses are being paid, and in the absence of a sizeable honorarium large enough to include it, they always are) and "the only other costs I anticipate are \$8.50 for getting to the Washington airport and back and

about \$7.50 for parking. From where I live, cab is prohibitive."

From this it is also clear that I was flying out for no income at all, no gain at all, and to do nothing else at all, for the parking charge allows for only a day to get out, a day to be there, and a day to return.

"Further to help you," I here repeated in writing what I had already offered verbally, I agreed to "forego" the honorarium "entirely" if Liebler would. Now here was I, giving up three days at the very least, for no gain and no chance of personal gain, flying accross th country and back in the worst ~~the~~ weather of the year, and there is something wrong in it in your corrupted version? Wherein did I have the slightest chance of even ~~any~~ nominal pay for this time? Is it somehow represensible to be paid for work? Yet I offered to work entirely free and not even to charge all my expenses!

I asked that they not even send me the money, but to arrange for the plane ticket themselves! ^{much more} How corrupt could I have been? I then offered to keep my time for that period flexible, to help them, and even offered to go out there still earlier if they arranged radio and TV shows that could build their gate, saying "this could help you with your expenses and perhaps yield a profit."

Remember that cutie, "First, ~~He~~ would wanted to seel his books at the door". This is ~~calculated dis~~ calculated distortion of what I actually said, aside from the impossibility of my being at the door and on the stage at one and the same time. It is, may I add, also entirely normal that an author's books be offered where he speaks. Autograph parties are quite common. But what I actually said is "sometimes the sponsoring groups like to sell books. This gives them the bookstore profit. With respect to my first three, I can shop them on consignment should you so desire."

This comes immediatly before your misrepresentation of what I said about my being away from home. You were ~~not~~ unaware of it. What immediately follows is anything but your misrepresentation, "a series of letters ~~xxxxxxx~~ arrived..." even for ~~done~~ with your record quite a portrayal of ~~a~~ single one of a single page. They were, recall you said "somewhat troubling" and in another

(entirely nonexistent)...he seemed to imply that he just ~~was~~ might not be able to attend the debate, after all."

"Truth is what? The very sentence after the one ~~you~~ you so openly took out of context, about my being away, "if the Shaw trial goes into the period now scheduled for the debate, I ~~might~~ ^{will} have to be there." I also pointed out that I considered it unlikely the defense would not arrange longer delays, as indeed they did, then and later. Remember, the defense had ~~claimed~~ I was part of a "conspiracy" to deny Shaw his rights, my alleged part of the non-existent conspiracy having been writing ~~OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS~~, and I had to assume I might therefore be subpoenaed. How much more "dishonest" could I be than to alert them to this possibility? Could I have been more deceitful? This was under date of January 19, and by return mail after getting theirs of January 16. They responded January 23 saying that the principal wanted assurances both participants would show up, Shaw trial or no Shaw trial, my ~~being~~ ^{being} a subpoenaed witness in his defense or not. My return-mail letter of January 23 began, "Your principal is quite right...Should the trial include the day of 3/22, I will fly to the debate and fly back. Especially because 3/22 is a Friday would that be no problem at all."

You have imposed upon the trust of your readers to put in my mouth words I never said, intentions that did not exist, and have false ~~said~~ ^{my} my letters say exactly the opposite of what they do.

In short, everything you say of any consequence about this entire affair is both false and deliberately so. In every instance you knew the fact was exactly opposite to your intended misrepresentation of it.

Then you imply that Liebel would not possibly want to avoid confronting me. As a matter of fact, he has, on every trip I have every made to California and in both the east and the midwest. He has agreed to confront me ~~and~~ ^{and} to show up, as in December 1966, when I gave up the syndicated Pyne show to debate him on the local Lomex show, and then he failed to appear. On the trip prior to the one in question, I did exactly the same thing, ~~giving~~ giving

up the same Tyne show (which effected a change of policy and did later use me) in order to confront him on the Crane Show. He almost didn't show there, delaying the show to the point where it was not possible to do a second one at that time, then corrupting the agreed-to format, and withall was so ~~unhappy~~ unhappy about what he did that he refused to confront ^{live} me the day after taping, before ^{its} airing, on the Stan Bohrman show on KHJ. I have written him in advance of these trips, proposing any kind of a confrontation he ~~elects~~ ^{elects}. I have even arranged for one where he had editing, censorship and total elimination rights and I had none of any kind. He has not once responded. He is so ~~reluctant~~ reluctant to write me that he has yet to pay me the five dollars he has owed me since the summer of 1966.

Whatever the reasons for the cancellation of the debate might have been, they are not as you and the letters represent them, are not in any way because of any of the alleged demands I never made, not because I in any way at any time altered or asked any alteration of the initial agreement, and certainly not because ^{there} was any doubt of my presence, my willing presence, or my fear of your great and good friend Liebel, who you even here, at the cost of your own integrity ^{or} ~~is~~ is that also before [?] ~~this~~ (is gone) defend.

If you cannot recognize in what you have here done a totality of dishonesty like nothing else, then you are a very sick man.

There seems to be no possibility any of this was accidental. I have said nothing for two months hoping that after learning what you might not have at the time you uttered and broadcast these lies, you might undertake to retract them, on your own. That you have not done. This renders you unfit for the association of people of honest intent, regardless of their beliefs, makes of you a man who deliberately imposes on the trust of others, and I will have nothing further to do with you. This record permits no other possibility. Unless you undertake to tell those to whom you have lied what the truth really is, you will further have damaged what you pretend to seek, the quest for truth, and will have imposed upon them as the Warren Commission could not have.

While this is an enormous waste of time, it at least establishes a record with which to compare your past lies and to eliminate any possibility any in the future can be accidental.